



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,563	10/23/2001	Mary Theresa Murray	3087.00007	7737

7590 03/25/2004

Kenneth I. Kohn
Kohn & Associates
Suite 410
30500 Northwestern Highway
Farrington Hills, MI 48334

EXAMINER

ANGELL, JON E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1635

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/001,563

Applicant(s)

MURRAY ET AL.

Examiner

J. Eric Angell

Art Unit

1635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-42 are currently pending and are addressed herein.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-8 and 21-24, drawn to a method of augmenting transient protein synthesis from endogenous mRNAs in a cell by delivering mRNA encoding translational regulatory proteins, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
 - II. Claims 9, 10, 18-20 and 25-28, drawn to a method of augmenting transient protein synthesis in cells by increasing protein synthesis of growth factors from endogenous cellular RNAs and exogenous mRNA delivered to the cell by delivering mRNA encoding growth factors and mRNA encoding translation initiation factors, classified in class 514, subclass 44.
 - III. Claims 17, 35, 37 and 38, drawn to a composition (i.e., a treatment or a therapeutic) comprising mRNA related to protein production, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
 - IV. Claims 12-16, 30-34, 36 and 39-42, drawn to a composition (i.e., a treatment or a therapeutic) comprising mRNA related to protein production and mRNA encoding a growth factor, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

It is noted that claims 11-17 are drawn to "a treatment" and claims 29-42 are drawn to "a therapeutic". Although a "treatment" or "therapeutic" may sometimes be associated with methods, the instant claims do not have any method steps. As such, the claims are clearly

Art Unit: 1635

product claims, rather than method claims. It is noted that claims 1-10 and 18-28 are methods which utilize the products of Inventions II and III, as set forth below.

It is also noted that claims 11 and 29 link(s) the inventions of Groups III and IV. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s). Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because Invention I encompasses a method for augmenting protein synthesis of endogenous mRNAs and involves delivering mRNAs encoding translational

Art Unit: 1635

regulatory protein(s), while Invention II encompasses a method for augmenting protein synthesis of endogenous mRNAs as well as exogenous mRNAs and involves delivering mRNAs encoding translational regulatory proteins as well as mRNAs encoding growth factors. The two inventions involve methods that require different functional materials and which have different functions and effects. Specifically, Invention I only requires delivery of mRNA encoding translation regulatory protein(s) which functions to increase protein synthesis of proteins of endogenous mRNAs; while Invention II requires delivery of mRNAs encoding translational regulatory proteins as well as mRNAs encoding growth factors wherein the function and effect of delivering the mRNAs is increased synthesis of protein from endogenous mRNAs and increased expression of growth factors encoded by exogenous mRNAs.

3. Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because the compositions comprise different materials and the compositions have different functions and effects. Specifically, Invention II comprises mRNA encoding translation regulatory protein, while Invention III comprises mRNA encoding translation regulatory protein as well as mRNA encoding growth factor(s). The function and effect of the composition of Invention II is to increase synthesis of proteins encoded by endogenous mRNAs, while the function and effect of the composition of Invention III is to increase protein synthesis of proteins encoded by endogenous mRNAs as well as growth factors encoded by exogenous mRNAs in the cell.

Art Unit: 1635

4. Inventions III and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case augmenting protein synthesis of endogenous proteins can be achieved by delivering DNA molecules encoding transcription factors that activate the expression of the target protein or by delivering DNA encoding transcriptional regulatory elements. Additionally the product (mRNA encoding translational regulatory elements) can be used in a materially different processes, such as producing the protein encoded by the mRNA in an in vitro translation assay or the mRNA can be used to raise antibodies that are specific to the mRNA, or the mRNA can be used in hybridization assays such as Northern blots.

5. Inventions IV and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case augmenting protein synthesis of endogenous proteins and exogenous proteins can be achieved by delivering DNA molecules encoding transcription factors that activate the expression of the target protein or by delivering DNA encoding transcriptional regulatory elements. Additionally the product (mRNA encoding translational regulatory elements and mRNA encoding growth factors) can be used in a materially different processes, such as producing the protein encoded by the mRNAs in an in vitro translation assay or the

Art Unit: 1635

mRNAs can be used to raise antibodies that are specific to each mRNA, or the mRNAs can be used in hybridization assays such as Northern blots.

6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

7. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for each Group is distinct from the searches required for the other Groups, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of growth factors in the claimed inventions: (see claims 13 and 31)

Species A:	PDGF-beta
Species B:	ILGF-II
Species C:	FGF-2
Species D:	TGF-beta
Species E:	EGF

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, it is believed that claims 12-16, 30-34, 36 and 39-42 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit: 1635

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Regarding the restriction of product and process claims, please note:

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Eric Angell whose telephone number is (571) 272-0756. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) with every other Friday off.

Art Unit: 1635

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John L. LeGuyader can be reached on (571) 272-0760. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

J. Eric Angell, Ph.D.
Art unit 1635



DAVE T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER